D.P.U. 93-66

Application of Cambridge Electric Light Company, under the provisions of G.L. c. 164, § 94G(a), for approval by the Department of Public Utilities of the Company's annual generating unit performance program relating to fuel procurement and use.

APPEARANCES: Eric J. Krathwohl, Esq.
Emmett E. Lyne, Esq.
Rich, May, Bilodeau & Flaherty, P.C.
294 Washington Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108
FOR: CAMBRIDGE ELECTRIC LIGHT COMPANY
Petitioner

I. INTRODUCTION

On April 1, 1993, pursuant to G.L. c. 164, § 94G(a), Cambridge Electric Light Company ("Cambridge" or "Company") submitted a petition to the Department requesting approval of proposed generating unit performance goals for the period July 1, 1993 through June 30, 1994. Section 94G(a) requires each electric company to file with the Department annual performance programs that provide for the efficient and cost-effective operation of its generating units. Each company's performance program must include proposed unit and system performance goals for availability factor ("AF"), equivalent availability factor ("EAF"), capacity factor ("CF"), forced outage rate ("FOR"), and heat rate ("HR").

Pursuant to notice duly issued, the Department conducted a hearing on the Company's petition on May 20, 1993, during which the Company offered as evidence the Company's initial filing, marked as Exhibit CELC-1; the testimony of the Company's witness, Richard W. Garlick, a results engineer for the Company, marked as Exhibit CELC-2; and revised Section 3 of the initial filing, marked as Exhibit CELC-3. The Department entered into evidence the Company's Exhibits CELC-1 through CELC-3, and the Company's responses to the Department's eight information requests, marked as Exhibit DPU-1 through Exhibit DPU-8.

II. CAMBRIDGE'S SUPPLY-SIDE PORTFOLIO

Under life-of-the-unit contracts, Cambridge receives electric power from Kendall 1 (17.0 MW), Kendall 2 (21.0 MW), and Kendall 3 (26.0 MW) fossil units; Kendall Jets (40.0 MW); Blackstone 1 (15.0 MW) and Blackstone 3 (2.0 MW) fossil units; 5.0 percent (28.4 MW) of the output from Canal 1, a 569 MW fossil unit, and 10.0 percent (57.9 MW) from Canal 2, a 581 MW fossil unit, both owned and operated by the Company's affiliate,

Canal Electric Company; 4.5 percent (26.5 MW) from Connecticut Yankee, a 588 MW nuclear unit, operated by Connecticut Light and Power Company; 3.6 percent (31.5 MW) from Maine Yankee, a 878 MW nuclear unit, operated by Central Maine Power Company; 2.3 percent (11.7 MW) from Vermont Yankee, a 520 MW nuclear unit, operated by Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation; and 0.7 percent (8.1 MW) from Seabrook, a 1150 MW nuclear unit, operated by the New Hampshire Yankee Corporation (Exh. DPU-3).

A five-year "CNL-NU" slice contract (21.4 MW) entitles Cambridge to power from Millstone 1, 2, and 3; Middletown 3 and 4; Montville 6; Norwalk Harbor 1 and 2; Northfield 1, 2, 3, and 4; South Meadow 11, 12, 13, and 14; Cos Cob 10, 11, and 12; Merrimack 2; and Vermont Yankee (id.; Exhs. CELC-1, § 3; CELC-3).

For the purpose of distinguishing those units that contribute most to system costs, performance programs identify major and minor units. Major units are units which contributed at least five percent of the system generation (as measured in megawatt-hours) in any of the previous three years, or units in which the Company has at least a 100 megawatt entitlement. Any unit that does not qualify as a major unit is a minor unit. The Company's major units are Canal 1 and 2, Kendall 2, Connecticut Yankee, Maine Yankee, and Vermont Yankee (Exh. CELC-1, § 5).

III. THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED GOALS

The Company proposed performance goals[1] for Kendall 1, 2, and 3; Connecticut Yankee; Canal 1 and 2; Maine Yankee; Vermont Yankee; Seabrook; Kendall Jets; Blackstone 1 and 3; Millstone 1, 2, and 3; Middletown 3 and 4; Montville 6; Norwalk

[1] In its Petition, dated April 1, 1993, the Company emphasized that its performance program incorporates performance "projections" rather than goals for those units which the Company does not own or operate (Petition, § 6).

Harbor 1 and 2; Northfield 1, 2, 3, and 4; South Meadow 11, 12, 13, and 14; and Cos Cob 10, 11, and 12 (Exh. CELC-3). Cambridge submitted proposed goals for its major and minor units that were calculated in a manner that was generally consistent with the methodologies approved in the Company's last performance program (Exh. CELC-1, § 1). See Cambridge Electric Light Company, D.P.U. 92-94, at 2-4 (1992).

Under the Company's goals proposal, the EAF goals for major and minor units were set at values corresponding to each unit's Target Unit Availability ("TUA"), the availability targets that the New England Power Pool ("NEPOOL") sets for each member utility's units under its Performance Incentive Program. In developing its proposed goals, the Company used the TUAs approved by the New England Power Supply Planning Committee ("NEPLAN") and adopted by the NEPOOL Executive Committee in January, 1993 (Exhs. DPU-1; DPU-2; CELC-3).

The Company calculated the remaining performance goals (i.e., AF, CF, FOR, and HR) in accordance with the major unit methodology approved in previous proceedings, regardless of whether units met the major or minor unit criteria[2]. The Company also

---

[2] AF goals were derived by adding to the EAF goal the ratio of average annual equivalent derated hours for the last three years to average annual period hours (Exh. CELC-1, § 7). CF goals were derived by multiplying the ratio of the three-year average CF to the three-year average EAF by the EAF goal (id.). FOR goals were derived by dividing projected FOH by the sum of projected FOH and SH (id.). Projected FOH were developed by dividing the three-year average FOH by the three-year average PH, then multiplying by the PH in the performance year (id.). Projected SH were developed by calculating the ratio of three-year average SH to three-year average AH and multiplying that ratio by the AF goal, then by PH in the performance year (id.). HR goals were set at the best (lowest) annual HR obtained during the previous three years (id.).

calculated system goals in a manner consistent with the methodology that has been approved by the Department in previous proceedings[3] (Exh. DPU-4).

IV. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The Department has reviewed the Company's goals proposal and finds that it includes all the units that should be included in the Company's goal-setting proposal. The Department also finds that proposed goals for major and minor units were calculated in a manner consistent with the methodologies approved by the Department in D.P.U. 92-94.

In D.P.U. 92-94, the Department found that several advantages would result if goals were adopted based on NEPOOL TUAs: (1) the methodology would produce the same EAF goal for generating units included in more than one company's supply portfolio; and (2) the methodology would reduce the time, effort, and expense incurred by a company in preparing goal-setting filings and by the Department in reviewing those filings. Cambridge Electric Light Company, D.P.U. 92-94, at 4 (1992).

In this proceeding, the Department reaffirms its findings in D.P.U. 92-94 and finds that the efficient and effective administration of Cambridge's performance program is best served by the goals proposal submitted by the Company in Exhibits CELC-1 and CELC-3. The Department approves the goal-setting methodologies implicit in that proposal, and the resultant unit and system performance goals, as identified in Exhibit CELC-3. The approved

---

[3] System goals for EAF, AF, CF, FOR, and HR were developed from the weighted averages of the goals for the individual units (Exh. DPU-4). The weighting factor for each unit was the ratio of unit to system generation as projected during the performance year (id.). Projected generation for each unit was calculated by multiplying the Company's entitlement in each unit's capacity by its CF goal (id.). Projected system generation was calculated as the sum of projected unit generations across the system (id.). For the system HR goal calculation, the weighting factor for each fossil and nuclear unit was developed as a ratio of unit to system generation, excluding the Company's hydro facilities, Northfield Units 1 through 4 (id.).

Cambridge unit and system goals based on NEPOOL TUAs are identified in Table 1 attached to this Order.

V. ORDER

Accordingly, after due notice, hearing, and consideration, it is

ORDERED: That the generating unit and system performance goals for Cambridge Electric Light Company, for the period July 1, 1993 through June 30, 1994, shall be those contained in Table 1 attached to this Order; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED: That, as part of its next performance filing, the Company shall submit proposed performance goals based on NEPOOL TUAs effective at that time, and shall comply with the requirements set forth in this Order; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED: That, pursuant to G.L. c. 164, § 94G and § 2.6(b) of the Department's performance program guidelines, dated December 8, 1981, the Company shall report on its progress under the annual performance program with each filing made pursuant to these guidelines; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED: That the Company shall file its next performance program goals by April 1, 1994, and the next performance period shall run from July 1, 1994, through June 30, 1995.

By Order of the Department,